

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ARTHUR LEE BELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES BIVEN, MARVIN BUTLER,
and the CITY OF DETROIT

Defendants.

_____/

Case No. 12-15077

Honorable Nancy G. Edmunds

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION [66]

On April 24, 2019, the Magistrate Judge entered an order and opinion denying Plaintiff's emergency motion to reopen his case and denying Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 64.) Plaintiff timely filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's order (ECF No. 65), and on May 23, 2019, the Court entered its order overruling Plaintiff's objection. Prior to the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's objection, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's order and the corresponding motions. (ECF No. 66.) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is now pending before the Court.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1(h) of the Local Rules for the Eastern District of Michigan, a party may move for reconsideration of an order within fourteen days of the order's issuance. For the motion to succeed, the movant "must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties . . . have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." E.D. Mich. L. R. 7.1(h). A court generally will not grant a motion for reconsideration that "merely present[s]

the same issues ruled upon by the Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.”
Id.

Plaintiff’s motion does not satisfy the requirements of Rule 7.1(h). Plaintiff has not set out a palpable defect by which the Court has been misled. Moreover, the issues raised by Plaintiff in his motion are a mere re-hash of the arguments raised in his objection, which have already been addressed by the Court. *See Smith ex rel. Smith v. Mount Pleasant Pub. Sch.*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 636, 637 (E.D. Mich. 2003) (“A motion for reconsideration is not properly used as a vehicle to re-hash old arguments or to advance positions that could have been argued earlier but were not.”). The Court sees no reason to address these arguments again. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is denied.

SO ORDERED.

s/Nancy G. Edmunds
Nancy G. Edmunds
United States District Judge

Dated: May 23, 2019

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on May 23, 2019, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Bartlett
Case Manager